

**REMARKS**

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on May 6, 2009. Claims 1, 20, 22-23, 28, 41, 44, 48, and 61 have been amended above. New claims 64-66 have been added above. Claim 19 was previously canceled. Claims 1-18 and 20-66, therefore, are currently pending in this application. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by way of the amendments presented herein. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and favorable action on all remaining claims in view of these amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 44, and 61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,606,323 to Heinrich et al. ("Heinrich") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0007473 to Strong et al. ("Strong") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,072,383 to Gallagher et al. ("Gallagher"). Applicant respectfully traverses these claim rejections.

Independent claim 1 has been amended above to recite a non-resonant receiving means for receiving a first signal and employing the first signal to generate a voltage. Applicant respectfully submits that Heinrich, Strong, and Gallagher, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach this claim feature much less its associated benefits. In contrast, Heinrich discloses a diode modulator for use in a radio frequency transponder. In particular, Heinrich discloses that "[t]he most preferred tag has an antenna which is resonant with the base station carrier frequency."<sup>1</sup> Such an arrangement fails to teach a non-resonant receiving means for receiving a first signal as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Gallagher discloses a method of decoupling a tag from a reader. Gallagher discloses an antenna circuit comprising a capacitive element or a primary resonant capacitor.<sup>2</sup> In particular, Gallagher discloses a tag having two loops (Loop 1 and Loop 2).<sup>3</sup> The current of Loop 1

---

<sup>1</sup> Heinrich, col. 4, ll. 22-23.

<sup>2</sup> See Gallagher, col. 4, ll. 47-53.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* at Fig. 2.

fluctuates between a high-current state and a low-current state while the current of Loop 2 remains at a high-current state. In this arrangement, when the tag is decoupled, Loop 2 continues to resonate and couple with another tag nearby due to Loop 2 remaining in a high-current state. Such an arrangement, therefore, fails to teach a non-resonant receiving means for receiving a first signal as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Strong discloses a method of avoiding conflict between two readers when reading the same tag. However, the conflict is resolved by a CPU and the readers<sup>4</sup> and not at the tag as is recited in the claims. Strong, consequently, contains no disclosure whatsoever regarding non-resonant receiving means for receiving a first signal as recited in amended independent claim 1. Applicant therefore, respectfully submits that amended independent claim 1 distinguishes over the combination of Heinrich, Strong, and Gallagher. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Similarly, independent claim 44 has been amended above to recite non-resonant receiving means for receiving a first signal and employing the first signal to generate a voltage. For substantially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to amended independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 44 distinguishes over the combination of Heinrich, Strong, and Gallagher. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 44 is respectfully requested.

Finally, independent claim 61 has been amended above to recite a non-resonant receiving means connected to an integrated circuit. For substantially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to amended independent claims 1 and 44, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 61 distinguishes over the combination of Heinrich, Strong, and Gallagher. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 61 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-27, 33-36, 39-46, 54-60, and 62-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinrich in view of Strong and Gallagher and further in view of U.S.

---

<sup>4</sup> Strong, Fig. 1.

Patent No. 6,525,648 to Kubler et al ("Kubler"). Applicant respectfully traverses these claim rejections. Dependent claim 19 was previously canceled, thus rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Claims 2-18, 20-27, 33-36, and 39-43 depend from, and further restrict, independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. Claims 45-46 and 54-60 depend from, and further restrict, independent claim 44 in a patentable sense. Claims 62-63 depend from, and further restrict, independent claim 61 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least those reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1, 44, and 61, dependent claims 2-18, 20-27, 33-36, 39-43, 45-46, 54-60, and 62-63 distinguish over the combination of Heinrich, Strong, and Gallagher. Applicant respectfully submits that the addition of Kubler fails to cure the deficiencies of Heinrich, Strong, and Gallagher as applied to independent claims 1, 44, and 61. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2-18, 20-27, 33-36, 39-43, 45-46, 54-60, and 62-63 is respectfully requested.

Claims 28-32, 37-38, and 47-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinrich in view of Strong, Gallagher, and Kubler, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,970,398 to Tuttle ("Tuttle"). Applicant respectfully traverses these claim rejections.

Claims 28-32 and 37-38 depend from, and further restrict, independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. Claims 47-53 depend from, and further restrict, independent claim 44 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least those reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1 and 44, dependent claims 28-32, 37, 38, and 47-53 distinguish over the combination of Heinrich, Strong, and Gallagher. Applicant respectfully submits that the addition of Kubler and Tuttle fail to cure the deficiencies of Heinrich, Strong, and Gallagher as applied to independent claims 1 and 44. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 28-32, 37-38, and 47-53 is respectfully requested.

New claims 64-66 have been added above. New claims 64-66 recite that the coil is not connected to, or tuned by, a resonant capacitor. As discussed above, Heinrich, Strong, and Gallagher each teach an arrangement where the antenna coil is connected to and tuned by a

resonant capacitor.<sup>5</sup> Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that new claims 64-66 distinguish over the cited references and are in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Dated: October 13, 2009

Respectfully submitted,  
Electronic signature: /Shoaib A. Mithani/

Shoaib A. Mithani  
Registration No.: 61,654  
WINSTEAD PC  
P.O. Box 50784  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
(214) 745-5400  
Attorneys For Applicant

---

<sup>5</sup> See Heinrich, col. 4, ll. 22-25; Gallagher, col. 4, ll. 47-65, FIG. 1.